

REMARKS

The art rejections

The prior comments are incorporated by reference.

Responsive to section 5 of the Office action, and with respect to claims 1-7. Applicants would like to add that Applicants are allowed to be their own lexicographers, please see MPEP 2111.01. The word "object" is defined in the specification, as pointed out before, e.g. at page 1, lines 18-20 and p. 3, lines 8-9. The specification also clearly explains at pages 1-5 that only an O-O context is intended and that the word "object" is to be understood only in that context.

Reading the specification any other way is contrary to its plain meaning. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is not at liberty to read the word "object" as meaning something else outside the O-O context as he appears to be doing in the rejection of claims 1-7. Withdrawal of this rejection is accordingly respectfully requested.

Rejection of claim 8

In rejecting the new claims, the Examiner combines Zhou with the admitted prior art. However, the admitted prior art relates to the field of object-oriented programming while Zhou relates to other programming. Moreover, Zhou is particularly concerned with the field of digital networks and the portions pointed to by the Examiner are fairly obscure portions in the middle of a large reference. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine the two references the way the Examiner does.

Applicants respectfully submit also that the Examiner is mis-reading the Zhou reference. Based on Zhou's abstract, Applicants conclude that Zhou makes a distinction between a path and a queue. It appears that — for Zhou — the term "path" has to do with a physical path for a

REMARKS

message or cell of a message to take out in the world, while a "queue" is a data structure inside a processing device. If Applicants' understanding of this distinction is incorrect, the Examiner is invited to explain why it is not correct. If Applicants' understanding is correct, it shows a difference in the use of the term "path" in Zhou and the term "path" in the present application. In the present application, the term "path" relates to processing within a processing device or devices, rather than physical message paths out in the world. It is important to recognize that the same word can have different meanings in different documents.

Applicants would further like to note the distinction between the word "destination" used by the Examiner in his rejection with the word "destiny" used by Applicants in their claims. In the Zhou reference, it appears that message cells know their "path" or "destination." In other words, messages need to travel from point A to point B in physical reality and they know where they are going. This is different from an "object" determining its "destiny" as defined in the current application. The objects of the present application are in some sense controlling their processing using their queue identifiers — the queues being structures within a processing device, not paths from point A to point B in physical reality.

Applicants will now discuss the parts of the reference pointed to by the Examiner, especially entry 52(c); the end of column 22 through column 23; column 4, lines 21-36; column 5; column 6, line 41-67; and column 8. This is a very long & complex reference, with 13 sheets of drawing and 30 columns of text. Accordingly, Applicants will only look at the portions pointed to by the Examiner.

Looking at Fig. 6, where entry 52(c) is located, Applicants note that this entry is located in a "connection table." This table seems to be a separate entity for storing queue information.

REMARKS

Accordingly, it seems to teach away from the idea of an object including its own queue identifier.

The text at the end of column 22 through column 23 seems to refer to figure 12 in the patent. This figure seems to show some fairly standard queue management. However, there is no queue indicator stored in an object. Instead, the queues themselves are illustrated as entities.

Column 4, lines 21-36 specifically says at line 29-30 that the cells themselves do not contain ordering information. The computer has to determine their order. Cell (I) only indicates that it is the last cell, i.e. and "end of packet identifier." An "end of packet identifier" fails to teach or suggest a queue identifier.

Column 5 talks about management of cells. As far Applicants can tell, the queue management involved is all external to the cells. There is a mention of a "path ... identifier" in col. 5, line 61, but, since this is a network type system, Applicants surmise that a path identifier relates to a transmission path in the external world for the cell, rather than a queue identifier.

Column 6, line 41-67, again talk about using tables to manage the cells, but again these tables appear to be external to the cells.

Column 8 refers to a "cell pointer table". This table, along with the queue management, seems to be external to the cells.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to present a *prima facie* case against claim 8; and in particular that he has failed to identify any entity in Zhou that is stored in a queue and contains a queue identifier.

REMARKS

Claim 11

This claim relates to normal and faulty outcome states. Against this, the Examiner cites an alleged "normal list" and "early list" from Zhou. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection fails to satisfy 37 CFR 1.104, because it fails to indicate where anything about a "faulty" outcome state may be taught or suggested in the references.

The Examiner's other rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the foregoing. Nevertheless, Applicants reserve the right to respond to those rejections and arguments at a later date.

Please charge any fees other than the issue fee to deposit account 14-1270. Please credit any overpayments to the same account.

Applicant respectfully submits that he has answered each issue raised by the Examiner and that the application is accordingly in condition for allowance. Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to	
Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria VA 22313-1450	
On _____	(date)
By _____	(signature)

Respectfully submitted,

By *A. F. Barschall*
Anne F. Barschall, Reg. No. 31,089
Tel. no. 914-332-1019
Fax no. 914-332-7719
February 9, 2004